

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Mr. WILLIE CLAUDIUS WATT,

Civil No. 07-2230 (DSD/SRN)

Plaintiff,

v.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

St. Paul Policeman FRANCISCO ORTIZ,
DOMINIC DZIK, Judge A. JAMES
DICKERSON, PUBLIC DEFENDER, and
CITY OF ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA,

Defendants.

Plaintiff commenced this action on May 8, 2007, by filing a self-styled civil complaint, and an application seeking leave to proceed in forma pauperis, ("IFP"). (Docket Nos. 1 and 2.) Shortly after the case was opened, the Court examined Plaintiff's pleading, and found it to be deficient in several respects. Therefore, by order dated June 6, 2007, (Docket No. 4), Plaintiff was directed to file an amended complaint within thirty days – i.e., by no later than July 6, 2007. The order expressly advised Plaintiff that if he did not file a new pleading by then, the Court would recommend that this action be dismissed without prejudice pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

The deadline for complying with the Court's order of June 6, 2007, has now passed, and Plaintiff has not yet filed an amended complaint. Indeed, Plaintiff has not communicated with the Court at all since he filed his original complaint at the outset of this case. Therefore, the Court now recommends, in accordance with the prior order, that this action be summarily dismissed, without prejudice, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). See also Link v. Wabash Railroad Co., 370 U.S. 626, 630-31 (1962) (recognizing that a federal

court has the inherent authority to “manage [its] own affairs so as to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases”).

Based upon the above, and upon all the records and proceedings herein,

IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that:

1. Plaintiff’s Application To Proceed In Forma Pauperis, (Docket No. 2), be **DENIED**;
and
2. This action be **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

Dated: August 20, 2007

s/ Susan Richard Nelson
SUSAN RICHARD NELSON
United States Magistrate Judge

Under D. Minn. LR 72.2(b) any party may object to this Report and Recommendation by filing with the Clerk of Court, and serving all parties by **September 5, 2007** a writing which specifically identifies those portions of this Report to which objections are made and the basis of those objections. Failure to comply with this procedure may operate as a forfeiture of the objecting party's right to seek review in the Court of Appeals. This Report and Recommendation does not constitute an order or judgment of the District Court, and it is therefore not appealable to the Circuit Court of Appeals.